

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Applicants amended claims 1 and 9 to correct minor errors. No new matter has been added.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 5-8 and 13-16 contain allowable subject matter. In view of the following remarks, applicants respectfully submit that their respective base claims are in allowable form. Applicants, accordingly, request that the Examiner allow these claims.

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,581 to Suonsivu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,515 to Kao et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,754 to Murphy et al.

The Examiner acknowledged that Suonsivu et al. fail to disclose "interrupting the intercommunication...and thereafter reconnecting the user and center, when the S/N is judged not to be within the predetermined range for a duration longer than a reference time." Page, 3, lines 6-8 of the Office Action. The Examiner relied upon Kao et al. as a combining reference to disclose an adaptive communications system that initializes and dynamically alters transmission parameters. Page 3, lines 11-17 of the Office Action. Kao et al., as applied by the Examiner, merely describe a scheme for adapting and optimizing bit and energy configurations of a connection, and do not disclose interrupting and reestablishing a connection based on any of the parameters described therein. The considerations of time in the cited portions of Kao et al. merely describe a performance parameter of—i.e., faster—initializations and adaptations. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that even assuming, arguendo, that it would be obvious

to one skilled in the art to combine Suonsivu et al. with Kao et al. in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest,

"causing a DSL interface containing unit to interrupt said intercommunication once and to thereafter reconnect said user and said center, when said signal-to-noise ratio is judged not to be within said predetermined range for a duration longer than a reference time," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

In addition, the Examiner acknowledged that the combination of Suonsivu et al. and Kao et al. would fail to disclose "wherein [in the] reconnecting process said DSL containing unit performs a handshake and an initialization so as to establish a negotiation for performing intercommunication with a DSL interface containing unit on the other side of the telephone line." Page 4, lines 7-10 of the Office Action. The Examiner cited Murphy et al. as a combining reference to disclose rapidly achieving Showtime. The cited portions of Murphy et al. merely describe a scheme for rapidly reducing noise by "fast retraining" a connection in response to changing connection conditions using stored transmission characteristics. (Please also see Fig. 8 and its corresponding description in Murphy et al.) Furthermore, the "fast retraining" described in Murphy et al. uses stored transmission characteristics that may not be current and may, therefore, be inapplicable to a reconnect that is done "when said signal-to-noise ratio is judged not to be within said predetermined range for a duration longer than a reference time," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added) Therefore, even assuming, arguendo, that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the references in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the above-cited features of claim 1.

Furthermore, since the "fast retraining" described in Murphy et al. uses stored characteristics based on connection conditions, it does not reconnect by "a handshake and an initialization so as to establish a negotiation for performing intercommunication with a DSL

interface containing unit on the other side of the 2-wire telephone line," as recited in claim 1.

(Emphasis added)

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 1, together with claims 2-4 dependent therefrom, is patentable over the cited prior art references for at least the above-stated reasons. Claim 9 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1 cited above and is, therefore, together with claims 10-12 dependent therefrom, patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons.


Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, an additional U.S. patent. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that this reference, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, including any extension fees, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: 100794-00208 (FUJ1 19.494)
DTC:jc